

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 1, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to claims 1 and 19-37, new claims 39-44, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 12, 19-37 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 39-51 are newly added. No new matter has been added and no new issues are raised which require further consideration or search.

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 12-13, 19, 25-27, 29, 31-32 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,540) in view of Ramalho et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0037746). The Office Action took the position that Sonti discloses all of the elements of the claims, with the exception of providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by the subscriber or the user, with respect to the number of users or addresses that can be registered. The Office Action then cited Ramalho as allegedly curing this deficiency in Sonti. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-18 are dependent, recites a method that includes receiving at least one registration request for registration of a user requesting a service in a network entity in a communication system. The services is identified by the network entity as belonging to a subscription permitting the user to access the service. The

method further includes providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by users belonging to the same subscription. The control information indicating a restriction on a number of users that can be simultaneously registered. The method still further includes controlling the registration based on the control information.

Claim 19, upon which claims 20-31 are dependent, recites a system that includes a network entity configured to receive at least one request for registration of a user requesting a service in a network entity. The service is identified by the network entity as belonging to a subscription permitting the user to access the service. The system further includes a providing unit configured to provide the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by users belonging to the same subscription. The control information indicating a restriction on a number of users that can be simultaneously registered. The system still further includes a controlling unit configured to control the registration based on the control information.

Claim 32, upon which claims 33-38 are dependent, recites an apparatus that includes receiving means for receiving at least one registration request for registration of users requesting a service. The service being identified as belonging to a subscription permitting the user to access the service. The apparatus further includes receiving control means for receiving control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by users belonging to the same subscription, said control information indicating a restriction on a number of users that can be simultaneously registered. The

apparatus further includes controlling means for controlling the registration based on the control information.

Claim 39 recites an apparatus, upon which claims 40-44 are dependent, recites an apparatus that includes a receiver configured to receive at least one registration request for registration of a user requesting a service in a network entity. The service identified by the network entity as belonging to a subscription permitting the user to access the service. The receiver is further configured to receive control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by users belonging to the same subscription said control information indicating a restriction on a number of users that can be simultaneously registered. The apparatus further includes a controller configured to control the registration based on the control information.

As will be discussed below, the combination of Sonti and Ramalho fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the features discussed above. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Sonti discloses a method for allowing subscribers of a telecommunications network to change between different sets of desired features. Once a mobile station performs an initial registration procedure, a default profile is assigned to the user. The default profile can be easily changed to accommodate varying subscriber conditions and preferences.

The Office Action took the position that Sonti fails to disclose providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by the subscriber or the user, with respect to the number of users or addresses that can be registered. Applicants agree that Sonti does not teach the above noted claim features, however, Applicants disagree that Ramalho cures those deficiencies of Sonti.

Ramalho discloses a method of supporting a mobile device that has multiple concurrent registrations of different personalities corresponding to one or more service provider networks. A mobile device 12 may simultaneously register multiple telephony based personalities with one or more network providers 14. The personalities denoted “A” and “B” may permit the user of the mobile device 12 to accept incoming calls and originate outgoing calls based on either of the two personalities. Paragraph [0019] of Ramalho discloses the registration process of mobile device 12 initializing and concurrently registering two personalities (e.g., “A” and “B”). Once the personalities are registered, the mobile user 12 is capable of performing mobile device user operations, such as sending and receiving data based on either of the two registered personalities.

Ramalho does not teach or suggest,

“providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by users belonging to the same subscription, said control information indicating a restriction on a number of users that can be simultaneously registered”, as recited, in part, in claim 1.

The personalities “A” and “B” are not comparable to a number of users. The personalities are simply two different profiles that are accessible by a single mobile device 12. (Emphasis added) The personalities of the single mobile device 12 cannot be interpreted as representing a number of users.

Ramalho further fails to teach or suggest providing a network entity with at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations. The Office Action took the position that a selected personality may be configured to be active only during selected times of the day while another personality may be active all the time, and that those specified personality attributes teach “limitations on simultaneous registrations”, as recited, in part, in claim 1. Applicants disagree and submit that the above-noted specific examples of user preferences (i.e., active/inactive times) associated with a particular personality are not the same as “providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by users belonging to the same subscription, said control information indicating a restriction on a number of users that can be simultaneously registered”, as recited, in part, in claim 1. (Emphasis added) It is clear from the claim language of claim 1 that the “limitation” is directed to “simultaneous registrations” and a “number of users.” Ramalho does not teach or suggest such a “limitation.”

The single mobile device 12 of Ramalho having one or more personalities is not comparable to the features of claim 1, which recites, in part “providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations

by the users belonging to the same subscription, said control information indicating a restriction on a number of users that can be simultaneously registered.”

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that the combination of Sonti and Ramalho do not teach or suggest all of the features recited in independent claim 1, and similarly independent claims 19, 32 and 39. By virtue of dependency claims 2-18, 20-31, 33-38 and 40-51 have also overcome the teachings of Sonti and Ramalho. Withdrawal of the rejection is kindly requested.

Claims 3-8, 11, 14, 18, 20-21, 28, 33 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonti in view of Ramalho and further in view of D’Amico et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,077,790). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Sonti and Ramalho are discussed above, D’Amico is directed to securing over-the-air registration of cordless telephones. D’Amico, at column 3, lines 3-27, describes checking credit information of a subscriber as complying (or not) with certain qualifying criteria. If the result is negative and the subscriber does not comply, the network operator enters an “invalid” flag into the network control center.

D’Amico, however, is silent as to the above-explained deficiencies of Sonti and Ramalho regarding the independent claims, namely “providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by the subscriber or the user, said at least one limitation being based on a number of users or a number of user equipment addresses that can be registered”, as recited, in part, in claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Sonti, Ramalho, and D’Amico fails to disclose or

suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1, and similarly independent claims 19 and 32. By virtue of dependency claims 3-8, 11, 14, 18, 20-21, 28, 33, and 37, have also overcome the rejection because D'Amico fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sonti and Ramalho. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 3-8, 11, 14, 18, 20-21, 28, 33, and 37 be withdrawn.

Claims 15-17, 22-24, 30, and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonti in view of Ramalho and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0009520 to Herrero et al. The Office Action took the position that Sonti and Ramalho teach most of the elements of the claims, but not all. The Office Action supplied Herrero to remedy the deficiencies of Sonti and Ramalho. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Sonti and Ramalho are discussed above, Herrero is generally directed to a method and system for handling multiple registrations. Herrero, at paragraph [0072] provides an allegedly simplified signaling flow of a registration process. The process begins with a user sending a registration request, along the way the system checks to see if the user is already registered (as can be seen in paragraph 0078), and, if not, eventually registers the user (as can be seen at paragraph 0081).

Herrero, however, is silent as to the above-explained deficiencies of Sonti and Ramalho regarding the independent claims, namely "providing the network entity with control information indicating at least one limitation on simultaneous registrations by the subscriber or the user, said at least one limitation being based on a number of users or a


number of user equipment addresses that can be registered”, as recited, in part, in claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Sonti, Ramalho, and Herrero fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 1, and similarly independent claims 19 and 32. By virtue of dependency claims 15-17, 22-24, 30, and 34-36 have also overcome the rejection because Herrero fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sonti and Ramalho. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 15-17, 22-24, 30, and 34-36 be withdrawn.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-38 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that all of claims 1-51 be allowed, and that this application be passed to issuance.

If, for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, Applicants’ undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Kamran Emdadi
Registration No. 58,823

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KE/kh:cqc

Enclosures: Additional Claims Transmittal
Check No. 018053